

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified Application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the Application.

The Examiner objected to the specification due to informalities of length and/or phraseology. Therefore, Applicant has replaced the Abstract herewith. The Examiner objected to the Title of the invention for not being descriptive. Therefore, Applicant has replaced the Title with this amendment with one that is now descriptive of the invention.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to contain all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, Applicant has rewritten claim 7 in independent form to include the limitations of base claim 1 and intervening claim 6. Applicant has further amended claim 7 to remove all use of the words "means" to clarify that it does not contain any means-plus-function limitations. These amendments are not intended to narrow claim 7 in any way.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over SanGregory et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,432,576) in view of Arisaka et al. (JP 10221740A). Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the following reasons. Applicant first notes that claim 1 is amended to make it clear that it does not contain any means-plus-function limitations, and to further clarify the intended meaning. Applicant further amended claims dependent from claim 1 to ensure that they maintain proper antecedent basis due to the amendments to claim 1.

From claim 1, one can see that the recited motor actuates both the diaphragm blade and the shutter blade. In contrast, SanGregory et al. disclose an actuator 3 that actuates aperture blades 1, 2. However, they fail to disclose that blade members of both the aperture blade and a shutter blade are actuated by the actuator 3. Arisaka et al. disclose that shutter wings 4, 5 are driven by a motor 6, while diaphragm wings 7, 8 are driven by motors 9, 10, respectively (See Fig. 1). Therefore, incorporating Arisaka et al. into SanGregory et al. cannot lead to the feature of the device recited in claim 1 that both of the diaphragm blade and the shutter blade are driven by a single motor.

Moreover, according to the present invention, the diaphragm blade, which is urged by the first forcing member toward the exposure aperture regulating position, are kept by the second forcing member at the exposure aperture regulating position, where it abuts on the stopper, even if a current to the coil is interrupted. SanGregory et al. fail to disclose such a structure at all. Arisaka et al. fail to disclose that, even without using the magnetic holding components, the second forcing member can keep the diaphragm blade at the exposure aperture regulating position, where it is caused by the first forcing member to abut on the stopper, even when a current to the coil is interrupted. Therefore, incorporating Arisaka et al. into SanGregory et al. cannot lead to the feature of the device recited in claim 1 that, even without using the magnetic holding components, the second forcing member can keep the diaphragm blade at the exposure aperture regulating position, where it is caused by the first forcing member to abut on the stopper, even when a current to the coil is interrupted.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance and requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Furthermore, since claims 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 each contains all the limitations of base claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that they are also in condition for allowance and requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.


The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over SanGregory et al. in view of Aisaka et al. and further in view of Tsuzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,086,267). Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the reasons noted above in regard to claim 1. Tsuzuki et al. do not make up for the limitations noted above in regard to SanGregory et al. and/or Arisaka et al. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is in condition for allowance and requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

ARISAKA -- 09/689,679
Client/Matter: 061069-0274432

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP



HENRY J. DALEY

Reg. No. 42459

Tel. No. (202) 775-9832

Fax No. 703 905-2500

Date: July 26, 2004
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000